

### Comments

The Examiner objected to claims 7 and 12 due to lack of antecedent basis. Claims 7 and 12 have been amended to comply with the Examiner's requirements.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 15 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 5,390,736 to Budde (Budde). Claims 7, 8, 10, 12, 14 and 15 were rejected as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 3,159,219 to Scott (Scott). Claims 7 and 12 were rejected as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 3,550,683 to Comeaux (Comeaux) and claims 7, 12 and 13 were rejected as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 6,425,442 to Latiolais, Jr., et al. (Latiolais). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner, in rejecting the claims, has misconstrued Budde. The "sleeve" referred to by the Examiner, namely, inner sleeve 102 of Budde, is not an inner sleeve but is a cementing plug. Cementing plug 102 has a tapered member at the lower end thereof to engage a socket that will prevent or limit rotation. Claim 1 has been amended to reflect that the inner sleeve will engage and cause an interference fit with an outermost diameter of the cementing plug. Budde does not disclose an apparatus that includes an inner sleeve for engaging the cementing plug wherein the inner sleeve will engage the outermost diameter of the cementing plug. As such, Budde cannot be said to anticipate claim 1. Claims 7 and 12 have been amended so that it is clear that the multiple curvatures define inner diameters that engage the cementing plug. Budde does not disclose an inner surface that defines multiple inner diameters having a magnitude smaller than the largest diameter of the inner surface wherein the curvatures engage the cementing plug to limit rotation thereof. As such, Budde cannot be said to anticipate claims 1, 7 or 12 or any of the claims that depend therefrom. It is therefore requested that the rejection based on Budde be withdrawn.

The rejection based on Scott should also be withdrawn. The Examiner has misconstrued Scott in identifying element 39 as a cementing plug. Element 39 is a ball check valve that closes a passage. The cementing plugs in Scott are identified with the letters P and T. Scott does not disclose an inner sleeve with multiple curvatures defining multiple inner diameters that engage a cementing plug. The Comeaux and Latiolais patents suffer from the same inadequacy. Neither discloses a sleeve with multiple curvatures wherein each curvature defines a diameter that will engage the cementing plug to limit the rotation thereof. Comeaux discloses a plug with a latching arrangement on the lower end thereof. Latiolais describes ribs and depressions but does not describe multiple radially inwardly extending curvatures that define diameters to engage a cementing plug.

Because none of the patents cited by the Examiner disclose each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 7 or 12, none of the claims are anticipated. Likewise, none of the claims that depend therefrom can be said to be anticipated. As such, the Examiner's rejections should be withdrawn.

Claim 16 is original claim 3 written in independent form which the Examiner had indicated was allowable. Claim 17 depends from claim 16 and is therefore allowable.

### **Conclusion**

Accordingly, and for the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request an early indication of the allowance of claims 1-17.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony L. Rahhal

Registration No. 37,562

McAFEE & TAFT

Tenth Floor, Two Leadership Square

211 North Robinson

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102

Telephone: (405) 235-9621

FAX No.: (405) 235-0439

E-Mail: [anthony.rahhal@mcafeetaft.com](mailto:anthony.rahhal@mcafeetaft.com)

Attorney for Applicant